

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/529,221

Applicant(s)

ROBERT ET AL.

Examiner

MARIANNE DIBRINO

Art Unit

1644

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 October 2009.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11, 13, 17, 28, 36-41, 46 and 49-65 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 5-7, 9, 13, 17, 28, 36-39, 41, 46 and 55 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4, 8, 10, 11, 40, 49-54, 56-65 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☒ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date attached hereto.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. Applicant's amendment filed 11/30/09 adding new claims 49-65 has necessitated the following new restriction requirement.

It is noted by the Examiner that Applicant had elected with traverse the Invention of Group I and without traverse the species of CD1d complex comprising the antigen α -GalCer fused to an scFv antibody fragment with specificity for Her2/neu, and wherein the said complex does not further comprise a costimulatory molecule, in Applicant's amendment and response filed 2/23/09 and Applicant's response filed 6/2/09.

It is also noted by the Examiner that in light of said prior species election, that the species of compound recited in newly filed claims 55 and 61, *i.e.*, wherein the CD1d molecule of the CD1d complex is linked to the amino terminus of the antibody or fragment thereof, does not appear to read upon the elected species. The elected species enunciated *supra* has specificity (at its amino terminus) for the Her2/neu antigen. These claims have thus been withdrawn by the Examiner as being drawn to a non-elected species of Invention I. If Applicant disagrees, Applicant is required to elect whether the CD1d molecule of the complex is linked to the amino terminus or to the carboxyl terminus of the antibody fragment.

2. This application contains claims directed to the patentably distinct species of CD1d-antibody complex of Group I:

a. The variable light domain and the variable heavy domain of the scFv antibody fragment are EITHER linked by a peptide bridge (claim 52) OR they are linked by one or more disulfide bonds (claim 53), AND

b. The antibody fragment is fused to ONE of EITHER the CD1d molecule OR to the β 2m molecule, AND

If the former, *i.e.*, the antibody fragment is fused to the CD1d molecule (claim 54), then the CD1d molecule of the complex is EITHER directly fused to the antibody fragment OR it is linked via an amino acid sequence of from about 3 to about 30 amino acid residues (claim 57), and if the latter, the short linker amino acid sequence comprises ONE of either SEQ ID NO: 1 (claim 58) OR SEQ ID NO: 2 (claim 59), OR

If the latter, *i.e.*, the antibody fragment is fused to the β 2m molecule (claim 60), then the β 2m molecule of the complex is EITHER directly fused to the antibody fragment OR it is linked via an amino acid sequence of from about 3 to about 30 amino acid residues (claim 63), and if the latter, the short linker amino acid sequence comprises ONE of either SEQ ID NO: 1 (claim 64) OR SEQ ID NO: 2 (claim 65).

The species are independent or distinct because claims to the different species recite the mutually exclusive characteristics of such species. These species have different structures, with different portions of the complex being linked to different other portions of the complex, and the molecules that comprise the complex thus have different primary amino acid sequences. In addition, these species are not obvious variants of each other based on the current record.

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable.

There is an examination and search burden for these patentably distinct species due to their mutually exclusive characteristics. The species require a different field of search (e.g., searching different classes/subclasses or electronic resources, or employing different search queries); and/or the prior art applicable to one species would not likely be applicable to another species; and/or the species are likely to raise different non-prior art issues under 35 U.S.C. 101 and/or 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species to be examined even though the requirement may be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected species, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

The election of the species may be made with or without traverse. To preserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the election of species requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse. Traversal must be presented at the time of election in order to be considered timely. Failure to timely traverse the requirement will result in the loss of right to petition under 37 CFR 1.144. If claims are added after the election, Applicant must indicate which of these claims are readable on the elected species.

Should Applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, Applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the Examiner finds one of the species unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other species.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, Applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 C.F.R. 1.141. If claims are added after the election, Applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. M.P.E.P. 809.02(a).

3. Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species or invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention. The election of an invention or species may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse.

Should Applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions or species are not patentably distinct, Applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions or species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the Examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C.103(a) of the other invention.

4. Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 C.F.R. 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a diligently-filed petition under 37 C.F.R. 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 C.F.R. 1.17(h).

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the Examiner should be directed to Marianne DiBrino whose telephone number is 571-272-0842. The Examiner can normally be reached on Monday, Tuesday, Thursday and Friday.

If attempts to reach the Examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, Ram Shukla, can be reached on 571-272-0735. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Art Unit: 1644

Marianne DiBrino, Ph.D.

Patent Examiner

Group 1640

Technology Center 1600

/Ram R. Shukla/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1644